UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,238	06/19/2001	Keiji Sato	1341.1098	9555

21171 7590 09/17/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/883,238	SATO, KEIJI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Van Handel	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8,11-16 and 19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8,11-16 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/07/2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an Amendment filed 6/07/2007. Claims **1, 2, 4-8, 11-16, 19** are pending. Claims **1, 8** are amended. Claims **3, 9, 10, 17, 18** are canceled. Claim **19** is new.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments regarding claims **1, 2, 6-8**, and **11-16**, and **19**, filed 6/07/2007, have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims **1, 6, 8, 11**, and **12**, see the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph below.

Regarding claims **8** and **16**, the applicant argues that Miller et al. fails to disclose receiving the program information about a program to be broadcast from the broadcasting unit and sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying an object displayed during and as a part of the program on a display screen displaying the

program. The applicant specifically argues that what is being recruited in Miller et al. is not a person to sponsor an object within a program, but the program. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted in the Office Action mailed 6/07/2007, Miller et al. discloses receiving transmitted program schedule data on signal input line 11 (col. 8, l. 14-15, 24-27). Miller et al. further discloses receiving Pay-Per-View (PPV) schedule information. A PPV menu screen display includes a video display section in which short promotional clips of current and future events and services can be shown to the user while the user is viewing the PPV scheduling information (col. 18, l. 14-18 & Fig. 22). When a user highlights a PPV event or service, he can order the event or service. Upon depressing the ENTER button, the programming schedule system presents the user with a PPV ordering screen (col. 18, l. 26-35 & Fig. 23). This display asks the user to choose from among a plurality of scheduled airing times (col. 18, l. 36-43). After the user has ordered a PPV event or service, the program schedule system presents the user with ordering confirmation submenus to confirm the PPV event or service (col. 18, l. 43-48 & Fig. 24, 24A). Since Miller et al. discloses the use of promotional clips to inform a user about a PPV event to be broadcast, the examiner interprets Miller et al. as meeting the limitation of "receiving the program information about a program to be broadcast from the broadcasting unit," as currently claimed.

Further regarding claims **8** and **16**, the examiner notes that videos inherently have video objects, such as scenes. Miller et al. discloses PPV menu screens for ordering a PPV program event (col. 18, l. 14-48 & Figs. 22-24A). Since the PPV program inherently includes video objects, the examiner maintains that Miller et al. meets the limitation of "receiving ... sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying an object

displayed during and as part of the program on a display screen displaying the object," as currently claimed.

Still further regarding claims **8** and **16**, the applicant argues that the examiner's interpretation of the word "sponsors" is overly broad in light of its dictionary meaning. The applicant specifically cites the Merriam-Webster on-line Dictionary, which defines sponsor as:

> 1: one who presents a candidate for baptism or confirmation and undertakes responsibility for the person's religious education or spiritual welfare
>
> 2: one who assumes responsibility for some other person or thing
>
> 3: a person or an organization that pays for or plans and carries out a project or activity; especially: one that pays the cost of a radio or television program usually in return for advertising time during its course

The applicant specifically argues that a sponsor does not include someone who purchases for his or her own consumption as in Miller et al. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted in definition 3 above, a sponsor is a person that pays for a project or activity, which in the case of Miller et al. is a user paying to view a PPV event (col. 18, l. 26-48). As such, the examiner maintains that the user of Miller et al. meets the limitation of a "sponsor," as currently claimed.

Regarding the newly amended phrase of claim **8**, note that the user of Miller et al. paying for the PPV event need not be the same user viewing the content (see citations regarding claim 8 below).

Regarding claims **1**, **2**, **6**, and **11-14**, the applicant argues that Rhoads et al. does not disclose extracting an object appearing in a program which is to be broadcast so as to generate an object extraction table in accordance with the information of the time or frame and display

position of the object on a screen. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant specifically requests that the examiner provide the column and line number in Rhoads et al. where it states that the extracted object is stored in a database. As noted in the Office Action mailed 6/07/2007, Rhoads et al. discloses a database that associates an action with watermark information. The database looks up an action, such as issuing a query to a web server and returning a web page to the user via the Internet, associated with watermark information extracted from the content (col. 5, l. 1-9, 65-67). This database is created when a user extracts video objects from a video sequence using an editing tool to draw boundaries around desired video objects. The encoding process records the screen location information for each object in the relevant frames and associates it with auxiliary information provided by the user (col. 8, l. 21-27, 54-67; col. 9, l. 1-18; & col. 10, l. 20-24).

Rhoads et al. further discloses that different types of information, including an object identifier, time or date, a frame identifier, a screen location, etc. are can be associated with objects and used for looking up actions corresponding to the objects from a server (col. 14, l. 47-54). The examiner further notes that the claims fail to recite that the extracted object is stored in the object extraction table. In fact, Applicant's specification states that the object extraction table records an object identifier for identifying an object, information about the time or frame at which the object is displayed in the program information, and the display position of the object (p. 22, lines 8-14), similar to the information used to associate the objects with the actions stored in the database/server of Rhoads et al. As such, the examiner maintains that Rhoads et al. meets the limitation of "extracting an object appearing in a program which is to be broadcast so as to

generate an object extraction table in accordance with the information of the time or frame and display position of the object on a screen," as currently claimed.

Further regarding claims **1**, **2**, **6**, and **11-14**, the applicant argues that Rhoads et al. does not teach generating the sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying the extracted object. The applicant specifically argues that the Office is being overly broad in interpreting the meaning of sponsor. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Rhoads et al. discloses that video objects may be linked to opportunities to rent or buy the content currently being viewed (col. 20, l. 26-27). The examiner interprets this as "sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying the extracted object," since the user is effectively paying to view the video object again. The examiner further maintains that this interpretation of the term "sponsor" is not overly broad (see arguments regarding claims 8 and 16 above).

Regarding the newly amended phrase of claim **1**, note the citations regarding claim 1 below.

Regarding claims **7** and **15**, the applicant argues that Kitsukawa et al. does not disclose relevant information. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted in the Office Action mailed 6/07/2007, Kitsukawa et al. discloses receiving advertising information prior to receipt of the scenes or television programs in which identified items corresponding to the advertising information appear, in which case the advertising information is stored along with timing data that links the advertising information in the corresponding scene or program (col. 6, l. 54-60). Applicant's specification describes "relevant information" as advertisement information about a commodity and the like displayed during a program (p. 10, lines 1-4). Since Kitsukawa et al.

discloses using timing information to link advertising information to a corresponding scene of a program, the examiner maintains that Kitsukawa et al. meets the limitation of "synchronously outputting the program information and relevant information in accordance with the stored sync information," as currently claimed.

Regarding new claim **19**, the applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach or suggest that information is displayed when the object designated by a user corresponds to the display frame and display position. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Rhoads et al. discloses specifying the location of video objects by drawing a boundary around the desired objects. This encoding process records the screen location for each object in the relevant frames and associates it with auxiliary information provided by the user, such as an object identifier. The encoder then creates a watermark message for each frame, including the screen location of an object for that frame and its object identifier (col. 8, l. 21-31). Rhoads et al. further discloses that, upon user selection of a video object (in a certain frame and at a certain location as designated in the encoding process), information associated with the object (i.e., a web page, etc.) is returned, rendered, and superimposed on the same display as the one displaying the video signal (col. 2, l. 40-53). As such, the examiner maintains that Rhoads et al. meets the limitation of "displaying the information about the object during the program when an object designation by a user corresponds to the display frame and display position," as currently claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims **1**, **6**, **8**, **11**, and **12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims **1**, **6**, **11**, and **12**, the applicant now refers to p. 11, lines 5-18 in support of the amended "transmitting the program information, advertisement information, and sync information to said receiving unit *separately from the program*," claim language (italicized for emphasis). The examiner notes; however, that the cited passage refers to a receiver 200 receiving program information, relevant information, and a sync-management table. When outputting the program information, the receiver refers to corresponding sync information in the sync-information management table and when outputting an object having relevant information, outputs the relevant information at the same time. The passage states that "[t]hereby, the present system can organically combine a program and an advertisement at the same time when providing the program." Applicant seems to suggest that, because the program information, advertisement information, and sync information are later organically combined with the program, they are separately transmitted from the program. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly, the cited passage does not state that program information, advertisement information, and sync information are combined with the program, but states that a program and an advertisement are combined. Secondly, combining the program and advertisement does not necessarily mean that the program and advertisement were transmitting separately from one another. Finally, the

applicant's specification seems to suggest that the program information is the outputted program, the relevant information is the advertisement information, and the sync information synchronizes the two. For instance, Applicant's specification states that "program information" is information-storing programs edited by a broadcasting station and is constituted of a video signal and an audio signal (p. 9, lines 12-22). Applicant's specification further states that the broadcasting unit transmits program information (p. 10, line 24; p. 25, lines 16-25; p. 26, lines 1-2; & p. 29, lines 21-24) and outputs program information in sync with relevant information (p. 11, lines 5-15; p. 26, lines 11-21; & p. 29, lines 10-16). This is also illustrated in the Figures. Step SA-4 of Fig. 4 illustrates the step of transmitting the program information, relevant information, and sync-information management table (Fig. 4). Step SB-1 of Fig. 7 illustrates the step of outputting program information, while step SB-8 of Fig. 7 illustrates checking whether the last frame of the program information has been reached (Fig. 7). Step SC-1 of Fig. 11 illustrates transmitting the program information, relevant information, and a sync information management table from the broadcasting unit, while step SC-10 of Fig. 11 illustrates checking whether the last frame of the program information has been reached (Fig. 11). Step SD-3 of Fig. 17 illustrates transmitting program information from the broadcasting unit, while step SD-10 of Fig. 17 illustrates checking whether the last frame of the program information has been reached (Fig. 17). As such, the examiner again fails to find support in the cited passage for the limitation "transmitting the program information, advertisement information, and sync information to said receiving unit separately from the program."

Further regarding claim **1**, the examiner fails to find support in the applicant's specification for the amended phrase "the object extraction table contains *only* information

regarding the object within a scene" (italicized for emphasis). In contradiction, the specification and Fig. 5 seem to describe the object extraction table as containing information regarding multiple objects within a scene.

Regarding claim **8**, the examiner fails to find support in the applicant's specification for the amended phrase "the sponsor being a person who pays for the broadcast for the object to be displayed in and as part of a program to a third party." Specifically, the examiner fails to find support in the specification for "for the object to be displayed in and as part of a program to a third party," as currently claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims **8**, **16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al.

Referring to claims **8** and **16**, Miller et al. discloses a receiving unit/method of receiving programs, broadcast by a broadcasting unit, by a receiving unit of a listener, the method comprising:

- receiving the program information about a program to be broadcast from the broadcasting unit and sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying an object displayed during and as part of the program on a display screen displaying the program (col. 8, l. 14-15 & col. 18, l. 14-18, 26-48);
- storing the program information and sponsor-recruiting information (col. 8, l. 24-27);
- outputting the stored program information and sponsor-recruiting information (Figs. 22-24A); and
- transmitting sponsor-designating information to the broadcasting unit for designating that the owner of the receiving unit becomes the sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying the object to said broadcasting unit (col. 18, l. 49-54).

Further referring to claim **8**, Miller et al. further discloses the sponsor being a person who pays for the broadcast for the object to be displayed in and as part of a program to a third party (the examiner notes that a user, for example a child, can order a PPV program if an authorized debit limit has been set by another user, as long as a purchase code has not been set)(col. 11, l. 25-27; col. 19, l. 52-57; & col. 25, l. 2-6).

3. Claims **1, 2, 6, 11-14**, and **19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rhoads et al.

Referring to claims **1, 2, 11**, and **13**, Rhoads et al. discloses a computer-readable recording medium/broadcasting unit/method of broadcasting programs, executed by a

broadcasting unit in a broadcasting system, said broadcasting system also including at least one receiving unit of a listener, the method comprising:

- reading program information from a program-information database provided in said broadcasting unit and image-analyzing the thus read-out program information (col. 8, l. 11-24 & Fig. 4);
- extracting an object appearing in a program which is to be broadcast so as to generate an object extraction table in accordance with the information of the time or frame and display position of the object on a screen (col. 5, l. 1-9, 65-67; col. 8, l. 21-27, 54-61; col. 9, l. 1-18; col. 10, l. 20-24; & col. 14, l. 47-67);
- generating advertisement information about the extracted object, which is carried out principally with reference to said object extraction table correlating the advertisement information to the object using the frame and the display position of the object (col. 4, l. 31-37; col. 5, l. 1-9, 65-67; col. 14, l. 47-67; col. 15, l. 17-27; & col. 19, l. 60-67);
- generating sync information to be used for synchronizing the program information with the advertisement information (col. 8, l. 24-26; col. 10, l. 34-43; & col. 13, l. 62-67); and
- transmitting the program information, advertisement information, and sync information to said receiving unit separately from the program (col. 8, l. 17-18; col. 16, l. 3-15, 20-28; & col. 17, l. 9-25).

Further referring to claim **1**, Rhoads et al. further discloses that the object extraction table contains only information regarding the object within a scene (col. 14, l. 50-51).

Referring to claims **6**, **12**, and **14**, Rhoads et al. discloses a computer-readable medium/method of broadcasting programs, executed by a broadcasting unit in a broadcasting system, said broadcasting system also including at least one receiving unit of a listener, the method comprising the steps of:

- reading program information from a program-information database provided in said broadcasting unit and image-analyzing the thus read-out program information (col. 8, l. 11-24 & Fig. 4);
- extracting an object appearing in a program which is to be broadcast to generate an object extraction table in accordance with the information of the time or frame and display position of the object on a screen (col. 5, l. 1-9, 65-67; col. 8, l. 21-27, 54-61; col. 9, l. 1-18; col. 10, l. 20-24; & col. 14, l. 47-67);
- generating relevant information about the extracted object, which is carried out principally with reference to said object extraction table correlating the advertisement information to the object using the frame and the display position of the object (col. 4, l. 31-37; col. 5, l. 1-9, 65-67; col. 14, l. 47-67; col. 15, l. 17-27; & col. 19, l. 60-67);
- generating sponsor-recruiting information for recruiting a sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying the extracted object (since a watermark is embedded in a video object within the currently viewed content, by buying or renting the currently viewed content the user is effectively paying for the cost of displaying that object when the content is watched again)(col. 15, l. 2-7 & col. 20, l. 23-28); and

- transmitting the program information and the sponsor-recruiting information to said receiving unit separately from the program (col. 8, l. 17-18; col. 16, l. 3-15, 20-28; & col. 17, l. 9-25).

Further referring to claim **14**, Rhoads et al. discloses a sponsor-designating information receiver, which receives the sponsor-designating information for designating that the owner of the receiving unit becomes the sponsor who pays for the cost of displaying the object to said receiving unit (col. 15, l. 1-7).

Referring to claim **19**, Rhoads et al. discloses a method, comprising:

- analyzing a program to determine display frame and display position of an object in the program (col. 8, l. 19-31 & Fig. 4);
- correlating information about the object in the program using the display frame and the display position (col. 4, l. 63-67 & col. 5, l. 1-9); and
- displaying the information about the object during the program when an object designation by a user corresponds to the display frame and display position (col. 2, l. 40-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **7**, **15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitsukawa et al. in view of Rhoads et al.

Referring to claims **7** and **15**, Kitsukawa et al. discloses a receiving unit/method of receiving programs, broadcast by a broadcasting unit, by a receiving unit of a listener, the method comprising:

- receiving the program information about a program to be broadcast from the broadcast unit, relevant information about an object displayed onto the display screen of the program, which is generated in the broadcasting unit including the advertisement information about advertisement of the object, and sync information for synchronizing the program information with the relevant information from said broadcasting unit, said sync information including the information about the time at which the object is displayed or the frames that contain the object and storing the received program information, relevant information, and sync information and synchronously outputting the program information and relevant information in accordance with the stored sync information (col. 6, l. 54-60).

Kitsukawa et al. does not disclose that the sync information include information about the display position at which the object is displayed. Rhoads et al. discloses a watermark that contains locations defining the screen locations of a related video object (col. 6, l. 10-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Kitsukawa et al. to include screen location information, such as that taught by

Rhoads et al. in order to provide an editor with more control over the display of supplemental content.

6. Claims **4**, **5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads et al. in view of Narayan.

Referring to claims **4** and **5**, Rhoads et al. discloses the method according to claim 1. Rhoads et al. does not disclose that the advertisement information is the auction information about auction of the object, and the method further comprising:

- receiving purchase values of the object to be auctioned from said receiving unit;
- transmitting the highest value among the received purchase values;
- deciding the listener transmitting the highest price as a successful bidder of the object when broadcasting of the program information is completed; and
- transmitting information about the successful bidder to the receiving unit.

Narayan discloses encoding data (including the highest bid) relating to an auction item in a television signal (p. 5, l. 21-22), allowing a user to transmit a higher bid (p. 7, l. 6-8), and determining that the user has the highest bid and allowing the user to pay the bid amount and receive the item after the auction time has expired (p. 17, l. 11-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Rhoads et al. to include encoding data relating to an auction item, such as that taught by Narayan in order to enable viewers of television systems to participate in auctions (p. 2, l. 19-20).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Van Handel whose telephone number is 571-272-5968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:30pm Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MVH

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600